Docket No.: 1817-0153PUS1

Page 6 of 9

**REMARKS** 

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 14 and 16 have been

amended. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is

respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that there is no antecedent basis for "the stamping" in claim 14 and

"the inductive element" in claim 16.

As the Examiner will note, claims 14 and 16 have been amended to address the

Examiner's rejection. Specifically, claim 14 has been amended to depend on claim 13 and

sufficient antecedent basis has been provided for the recitation "the metal stamping."

Furthermore, claim 14 has been amended to recite "an" inductive element.

In addition to the above, claim 16 has been amended to depend on claim 15 and proper

antecedent basis has been provided for the recitation "inductive element."

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that

claims 14 and 16 are definite and clear. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the

Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP PCL/CI

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 15-16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ferencz, USPN 6,677,847. Claims 5, 7, 13, 14, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferencz in view of Gillett et al., USPN 4,803,609.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and

103 are improper. The present application was filed on March 27, 2003 as International

Application No. PCT/IE03/00048. The present application also claims priority to IE Application

Nos. S2002/0221 and S2002/0223, which were filed on March 27, 2002. On the PTOL/326

Form mailed on August 22, 2006, the Examiner acknowledges that the claim for priority and

receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International

Bureau. Since the priority documents were filed in the English language, there is no need to

submit a verified translation of the priority documents in order to perfect the claim to priority of

March 27, 2002. In view of this, the effective filing date of the present application is March 27,

2002.

Referring to the Ferencz reference relied on by the Examiner, this patent was published

on January 13, 2004 and was filed on August 15, 2002. Therefore, the effective date of this

reference (August 15, 2002) is after the effective filing date of March 27, 2002 of the present

application. In view of this, the Refrencz reference is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §

102 and is therefore not available as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are improper and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Since the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome, and since the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 have shown to be improper, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early allowance of the above-identified application are therefore respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of-the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/509,026 Amendment dated February 21, 2007

Reply to Office Action of August 22, 2006

Docket No.: 1817-0153PUS1

Page 9 of 9

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant